

Application No. 09/821,005
Reply dated October 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2006

UV-189

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-17, 24-30, 33-35, 38-45 and 52-58 are pending in the above-identified application.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-17, 24-26, 29, 30, 33-35, 38-45, 52-54, 57 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,185,360 (hereinafter "Inoue").

Claims 27, 28, 55, and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue.

II. Applicants' Reply to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-17, 24-26, 29, 30, 33-35, 38-45, 52-54, 57 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' claims are directed towards systems and methods for reducing cut-offs when programs are recorded. More specifically, applicants' independent claim 1 specifies receiving at the user equipment a user selection of a program to record, predicting by the user equipment a time change associated with the program, and recording by the user

Application No. 09/821,005
Reply dated October 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2006

UV-189

equipment the program to compensate for a time change based on the predicted time change.

Inoue refers to an information receiving system and method for detecting overlapping of recording time of programs and selecting a program to record based on comparing transmitted service additional information of the programs that are overlapping in recording time. For example, Inoue shows in column 8, lines 32 through 67 "service additional information including the change information of the broadcasting time that the broadcasting time of the baseball game is extended by 20 minutes is sent from the transmitting side, and the information receiving apparatus receives the service additional information containing this change information." Subsequently, "it is judged whether this program overlaps with the recording time of other plural reserved programs." If an overlapping of recording time is detected among the plural reserved programs, a comparing and determining means compares the programs and "determines which program to record."

Inoue does not teach a method for predicting by the user equipment a time change associated with the program selected by the user to be recorded. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, judging whether a program "overlaps with the recording time of other plural reserved programs" does not constitute a time change prediction. Instead, as clearly described in Inoue (see above), this step merely refers to

Application No. 09/821,005
Reply dated October 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2006

UV-189

detecting whether there is an overlap in order to determine what program to record in case there is. No time change is taken into account, let alone predicted, by the user equipment if an overlap exists in this situation. Moreover, even if a time change were taken into account in such a situation, the user-side "receiving apparatus" described by Inoue would have to receive "service additional information" from the transmitting side in order to adjust the recording time for the "plural reserved programs," as opposed to locally making a prediction using the user equipment, as specified in independent claim 1.

For at least this reason, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable. Because claims 2, 5-7, 10-17, and 24-26 directly or indirectly depend from allowable claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 5-7, 10-17, and 24-28 are also allowable.

Independent claim 29 recites similar subject matter as independent claim 1. As set forth above, Inoue fails to describe this subject matter. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 29 is allowable. Because claims 30, 33-35, 38-45, 52-54, 57 and 58 directly or indirectly depend from allowable claim 29, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 30, 33-35, 38-45, 52-54, 57 and 58 are also allowable.

Application No. 09/821,005
Reply dated October 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2006

UV-189

Applicants thus request that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-17, 24-26, 29, 30, 33-35, 38-45, 52-54, 57 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

III. Applicants' Reply to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 27, 28, 55 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have demonstrated that independent claims 1 and 29 are allowable. Because claims 27, 28 dependent from allowable claims 1, and because claims 55 and 56 dependent from allowable claim 29, applicants respectfully submit that claims 27, 28, 55 and 56 are allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of claims 27, 28, 55 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Application No. 09/821,005
Reply dated October 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2006

UV-189

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Hassan Albakri
Limited Recognition No. L0013
Agent for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
Tel.: (212) 596-9000